

LUC-466/ Florkey 16-10-24

13

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are pending in the application. Claims 1-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**Rejection Under Madour and Smith**

Claims 1, 18 and 25-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Number 6,266,405 issued to Madour on July 24, 2001 in view of U. S. Patent Number 6,122,362 issued to Smith on September 19, 2000.

Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

First, applicants' claim 1 recites,

"one or more provisioning components, that run on a hardware component, the one or more provisioning components being operable to initiate requests to port a directory number for a duration of time, receive updates for one or more directory numbers ported to a network, and notify a subscriber database of the directory number to port for the duration of time; and

a portability component that runs on a hardware component automatically updates the one or more provisioning components to port the directory number for the duration of time, wherein the portability component communicates with a management component through employment of one or more protocols to update one or more local number portability databases, at least one of the one or more protocols being a Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP)."

As stated in the Office Action, Madour does **not** teach or suggest SNMP. Applicants agree that Smith discloses SNMP, however, Smith does **not** utilize SNMP in the manner recited in applicants' claim 1. Specifically, Smith discloses a provisioning system, i.e., NEMS 19, connected to a network management system (NMS) 45. See FIG. 2. NMS 45 communicates with NEMS 19 and receives system management data, e.g., alarms, from NEMS 19 over SNMP. See column 7, lines 37-42. By contrast, applicants' claim 1 requires the portability component to communicate with a management component via SNMP. Also, the portability component communicates

LUC-466/ Florkey 16-10-24

14

with the management component to update one or more local number portability databases rather than to communicate system management data, e.g., alarms as done in Smith. Thus, Smith, similar to Madour, is missing "wherein the portability component communicates with a management component through employment of one or more protocols to update one or more local number portability databases, at least one of the one or more protocols being a Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP)" elements, as recited in applicants' claim 1.

Therefore the proposed combination of Madour and Smith does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in applicants' claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 2-17 and 22-29 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Independent claims 18 and 21 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown are not taught by the proposed combination of Madour and Smith. For example, claim 18 recites, "communicating with a management component through employment of one or more protocols to update one or more local number portability databases, at least one of the one or more protocols being a Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP)" and claim 21 recites "means in the computer-readable storage medium for communicating with a management component through employment of one or more protocols to update one or more local number portability databases, at least one of the one or more protocols being a Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP)". The proposed combination of does not teach or suggest these limitations for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claims 18 and 21 are likewise allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 19-20 depend from claim 18, these dependent claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Second, the proposed combination does not teach or suggest "wherein the telephony device is a personal computer" as recited in claim 27. This is because Madour, which was cited by the Examiner in the rejection of claim 27, does not disclose a personal computer in the drawings or description. Also, Madour discloses in column 5, lines 60-66,

LUC-466/ Florkey 16-10-24

15

As discussed above, "Transaction Capability" flag 101 is added to the message 100 to indicate whether the originating mobile switching center/end user terminal/network node is capable of initiating Internet calls to a destination IP address. If the flag 101 is "set," then the capability of supporting Internet addressing is indicated. Conversely, if the flag is "cleared," then Internet addressing is not supported.

The Examiner has cited the term "end user terminal" as an equivalent to the term "personal computer" recited in claim 27. Applicants disagree. Within the context of the wireless network disclosed in Madour, the "end user terminal" may be a subscriber's wireless capable device, such as a wireless terminal, i.e., handset, with Internet access capabilities or a desktop computer, i.e., workstation, with Internet access. Since the term "end user terminal" may refer to a wireless terminal or a desktop computer, Madour is missing the "personal computer" element, as recited in applicants' claim 27.

Rejection Under Madour, Smith, Mazzarella, Moss and Petrunka

Claims 2-17, 19-20 and 22-24 and were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Madour and Smith in view of U. S. Patent Number 6,819,921 issued to Mazzarella et al. on November 16, 2004 and in view of U. S. Patent Number 6,785,372 issued to Moss on August 31, 2004.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Madour and Smith in view of U. S. Patent Number 6,584,193 issued to Petrunka on June 24, 2003.

Applicants respectfully traverse these grounds of rejection.

These rejections are based on the rejection under Madour and Smith being proper. As that ground of rejection has been overcome, and none of the cited references teach or suggest "wherein the portability component communicates with a management component through employment of one or more protocols to update one or more local number portability databases, at least one of the one or more protocols being a Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP)", as recited in independent claim 1, or "communicating with a management component through employment of one or more protocols to update one or more local number portability databases, at least

LUC-466/ Florkey 16-10-24

16

one of the one or more protocols being a Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP)" as recited in independent claim 18 or "means in the computer-readable storage medium for communicating with a management component through employment of one or more protocols to update one or more local number portability databases, at least one of the one or more protocols being a Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP)" as recited in independent claim 21, the combination of Madour, Smith, Mazzarella, Moss and Petrunka does not supply these missing elements. Thus, this combination does not make obvious any of applicants' claims, all of which require the aforesaid limitations.

New Claims

New claims 30-32 have been added. Claims 30-32 provide additional limitations directed to the portability component. No new matter has been added.

JUN 02 2010

LUC-466/ Florkey 16-10-24

17

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



James Milton
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 46,935

Dated: June 2, 2010

CARMEN PATTI LAW GROUP, LLC
Customer Number 47382
(312) 348-2800